

higher orbits, all facility costs, and adequate fleets of shuttles and tugs to handle the future anticipated traffic of more than 700 flights in 13 years.

"Cost-effectiveness of the shuttle does not depend on its being associated with a space station program. Reductions in launch and payload costs with use of the shuttle, and cost reductions from retrieval of satellites for return to earth and reuse are expected to attract a large number of users from the national and international governments, commercial and scientific groups. Missions would include deployment of unmanned satellites, repair as well as retrieval of satellites and space rescue and long duration orbital science and application missions.

"Results of the Mathematica studies show that launch cost savings are significant using the shuttle instead of expendable launch vehicles—from about \$1,000 to about \$100 per pound per payload—and that savings of nearly 50 percent in payload costs are possible because of reusable and less complex designs of payloads carried by the shuttle as compared with payloads on expendable launch vehicles.

"Results of the study show that in a program of 500 flights over a 13-year period a return on investment of 10 percent would be achieved. If space activity reached a total of 700 flights over the same period the return on investments would be close to 15 percent.

"Since the date of the Rand report quoted by Sen. Mondale, the Air Force has continued to support the NASA shuttle program. In a statement to the U.S. Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences on March 30, 1971, Robert C. Seamans, Jr. Secretary of the Air Force said:

"A reusable space transportation system with proper capabilities and operational flexibility can offer an opportunity to provide an economical way to transport payloads into and out of space. . . . Development of space shuttle which employs fully reusable stages rather than expendable ones appears to be the surest way to achieve a sizeable cost reduction. . . . the national investment could be amortized in about a decade after the system becomes operational. . . .

"The Air Force supports the proposed NASA FY 1972 space shuttle effort."

SENATOR CASE PROBES FUNDING OF THAI TROOPS IN LAOS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Members of the Senate, and indeed our whole Nation, are deeply concerned over the extent of the U.S. involvement in war in Indochina. New facts keep coming to light, on situations which could further involve the United States though we feel we are pursuing a national policy of disengagement from the Indochina war.

My colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) has taken the initiative in probing a question of considerable concern—financing by the United States of Thai troops fighting in Laos. Senator CASE's initiative—reflecting his very alert and informed attention to this matter—has been the subject of a number of recent articles in the press. I believe that it would be useful to have a selection of the those articles, laying out the story for all to read, printed in the RECORD. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that eight press articles on the issue be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 21, 1971]
CASE SAYS UNITED STATES SECRETLY PAYS COSTS OF THAI TROOPS IN LAOS

(By Murray Marder)

The United States is secretly paying "through CIA" for the costs of "four to six thousand Thai troops in Laos" without any direct action by Congress, Sen. Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.) said yesterday.

Case called on the administration for "the specific terms of the agreement," which he said he first read about in the press last month. "Congress has never directly voted a penny to pay Thai troops in Laos," said Case, and both Congress and the public have "a right to know" what is happening.

Thailand has denied having any troops in Laos; its officials have said only that there may be Thai "volunteers" or "ethnic Thais" serving in Laos. U.S. officials have been publicly silent on the subject, except to refer back to the elliptical Thai statements.

Case finally got a reply yesterday to a letter he sent on April 23 to the State Department—but he said the reply was marked secret.

The substance of the reply to Case, according to State Department spokesman Charles W. Bray, was that "nothing is being done that is not within present legislative authority." Bray said the subject had been discussed in closed session with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which Case is a member, and State could discuss the matter further only in the same manner.

Case said last night that "I'm still not satisfied. . . . We should have been advised before the thing started, rather than having it dribble out afterwards in a way in which we can do little more than wring our hands."

The senator said that as he recalls, the subject of Thai units in Laos was only "touched on" by Central Intelligence Agency director Richard Helms, in a closed meeting.

After reading press accounts last month about a new U.S.-Thai agreement "for a sharp increase in Thai troops to be used in Laos," said Case, he made his own inquiries.

"I was able to ascertain," said Case, "on an absolutely not for quotation basis, from government sources that there are four to six thousand Thai troops in Laos and the U.S. government, through CIA, is paying for them."

Case said that "If an action by our country cannot stand up to public exposure, then our leaders should seriously reconsider that action."

His letter to Secretary of State William P. Rogers asked if financial support for Thai troops in Laos violated a congressional ban on payment of mercenaries in Laos except to aid American troop withdrawals or aid in release of U.S. prisoners; the terms of the Thai agreement; and whether the United States agreed to provide support "in event the Thai troops in Laos encounter difficulties."

[From the New York Times, May 22, 1971]
UNITED STATES SAID TO PAY THAIS AIDING LAOS—FULBRIGHT SAYS FINANCING OF 4,800 VIOLATES THE LAW

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON.—Senator J. W. Fulbright said today that 4,800 Thai troops, financed by the United States, were fighting in Laos in support of the Royal Laotian Government.

Mr. Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, suggested that such support by Thai troops in Laos was "inconsistent with the spirit" of the "anti-mercenary" amendment that had been incorporated in the Defense appropriations bill at his suggestion.

The amendment provided that none of the defense funds could be used "to support Vietnamese or other free-world forces in actions

designed to provide military support and assistance to the Government of Cambodia or Laos."

Among other aims, this provision was specifically designed to prevent the introduction of American-financed Thai troops into Laos or Cambodia.

But as part of the compromise leading to House and Administration acceptance of the Fulbright "anti-mercenary" amendment, a clause was included specifying that the amendment would not "prohibit support of actions required to insure the safe and orderly withdrawal or disengagement of United States forces from Southeast Asia or to aid in the release of Americans held as prisoners of war."

The State Department refused to confirm or deny the figure of 4,800. But its spokesman, Robert J. McCloskey, said the department had informed Senator Fulbright, an Arkansas Democrat, and Senator Clifford P. Case of New Jersey, a Republican member of the committee, that American support of Thai troops in Laos did not violate the "anti-mercenary" amendment.

There have been recurring reports of Thai battalions fighting the Communists in Laos, particularly in the north in support of an irregular army of mountain tribesmen financed by the Central Intelligence Agency.

However, Mr. Fulbright offered the first authoritative estimate of the size of the Thai contingent. He made his statement after the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Foreign Commitments, headed by Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat of Missouri, had received a secret briefing from two committee staff members, James C. Lowenstein and Richard M. Moose, who recently returned from a 10-day inspection trip to Laos.

The State Department sent letters yesterday to Senators Case and Fulbright that clearly indicated that the Thai participation in the war in Laos was being supported financially by the Central Intelligence Agency.

LETTERS CLASSIFIED SECRET

The letters, responding to questions by the Senators about reports of Thai troops in Laos, were classified secret, and the State Department and the Senators therefore refused to make the texts public.

But department officials said that the letters had declared that the costs of supporting the Thai troops did not come within the State Department's jurisdiction thus clearly pointing to the C.I.A. as the agency providing financial support.

The letters, department officials said, contended that financial support for Thai troops in Laos did not violate the "anti-mercenary" amendment.

The executive branch could argue—although the State Department did not in the letters—that the use of Thai troops in northern Laos were related to the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam and thus permissible under the Fulbright amendment.

But the Administration would be somewhat handicapped in advancing such an argument because of a statement made last month by William H. Sullivan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, before the Senate Refugee Subcommittee headed by Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts.

In his prepared testimony, Mr. Sullivan said that the "other war" in northern Laos "has nothing to do with military operations in South Vietnam or Cambodia."

Alternatively, the Administration could argue that the "anti-mercenary" amendment applied only to Defense Department appropriations and not to funds provided to the C.I.A.

In protesting yesterday on the Senate floor against the financing of Thai troops in Laos without the knowledge or approval of Con-

June 4, 1971

gress, Mr. Case observed that "the money comes out of that vast treasure chest, which Congress has appropriated but never controlled, for discretionary military and intelligence purposes."

"The agreement to provide financial support to the Thai troops apparently predates enactment of the Fulbright amendment last December.

According to reports from Vientiane, the Laotian administrative capital, the Thai battalions were first introduced about a year ago when the C.I.A.-supported army of mountain tribesmen, commanded by Maj. Gen. Vang Pao, was under severe pressure from the Communist forces.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 1, 1971]

UNITED STATES ROLE IN LAOS STIRS RUMBLINGS IN CONGRESS

(By George W. Ashworth)

WASHINGTON.—American activities in Laos—and the administration's extreme reluctance to talk about them—threaten now to increase the President's difficulties on Capitol Hill and with the public.

Little is known outside administration circles of the precise extent of American involvement in Laos. This administration—like the Democratic administration before it—simply does not want to discuss the subject at all. Senators have run into difficulty finding out even in private just what is going on.

That fact is much more worrisome to the regular critics of the President's policies in Indo-China, such as Sen. J. W. Fulbright (D) of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that it is to those more favorably inclined to the President's war policies.

But Laos provides a source of contention, and the administration now is urged by critics to level with Capitol Hill and with the public.

This newspaper reported a month ago that the administration has worked out an agreement with the Government of Thailand for sharply increased use of Thai forces in Laos in support of the neutralist government.

It was reported that, as a consequence, the use of Thai forces had sharply risen in Laos over some months from well under 1,000 to a figure believed in excess of 4,000. And, from all indications, the Thai Government was willing to provide far more if the American administration would provide funds.

The story prompted Sen. Clifford P. Case (R) of New Jersey to fire off a letter to Secretary of State William P. Rogers asking comment on the accuracy of the reports, and, assuming correctness, answers on five points:

Does the administration consider the financial support of Thai troops in Laos to be in accord with the Cooper-Church provisions in the 1970 Defense Appropriations Act that bans the payment of mercenaries except to protect a safe and orderly American withdrawal or disengagement from Southeast Asia or to aid in the release of United States prisoners?

In the agreement with Thailand to be presented as a treaty to the Senate?

What are the agreement's specifics, including cost and duration?

Will supplemental appropriations be asked, or is reprogramming envisioned?

Has the U.S. Government given the Thais assurance of support in the event Thai troops encounter difficulties?

BRIEF RESPONSE

According to sources, the administration's written response was far from elaborate. Further elaboration is being sought. After comparing the State Department report with information given by two Foreign Relations Committee aides just back from Laos, Senator Case described the administration reply

as "incomplete and in certain respects inaccurate."

Marshall Green, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern and Pacific Affairs, is expected in the near future to be available to brief the committee in secret session on the Laos operations.

The Thai troops are not the only issue related to Laos that has drawn senatorial interest. So far, the costs of various activities in Laos are sketchy at best. The only generally available figure is \$50 million or so per year for activities of the Agency for International Development (AID).

MILITARY AID DISCLOSED

Total military assistance funded by the services in Laos in fiscal 1970 was disclosed in subcommittee hearings as \$90 million. But the figures for fiscal 1971, which now is drawing to a close, and fiscal 1972, beginning July 1, are so far not on the record.

Nor is the cost of the U.S. establishment in Laos or of bombing missions in support of the fighting in northern Laos on the record.

This administration and the one before it argue that full or relatively full disclosure would make the U.S. in clear violation of the Geneva Accords that established the theoretical neutrality of Laos.

The North Vietnamese have been extremely active in Laos for years. And the Americans have been in the fray as a counter to that North Vietnamese activity.

REASON FOR RELUCTANCE

Since the North Vietnamese will not admit what they are doing, the Americans are also reluctant to be open on the matter. To do so would not only hurt the bargaining position of the South Vietnamese side, but it would also give the North Vietnamese substantial ammunition for propaganda warfare. And, beyond that disclosure could, it is argued, make it almost certainly impossible to re-establish neutrality under the present Geneva Accords.

As a result of this policy, however, the North Vietnamese, the Pathet Lao, the Royal Lao Government, the Americans involved, all Communist-bloc nations, and other interested parties have a pretty clear idea of what the North Vietnamese and the Americans are doing. Left out in the informational cold are the Congress and the American public.

OVERSEEING FUNCTION

In such a circumstance, critics argue, the overseeing function of the Congress cannot be exercised, and it is necessary to take the administration on blind faith in such matters. For doubters, such as Mr. Fulbright and Mr. Case, blind faith is not enough.

Much of the American effort in Laos is being carried out under the direction of the Central Intelligence Agency. One skeptic said, "From what I can gather, the CIA is doing a very capable job in Laos. No other group, such as the Army, could do nearly so well. From the point of view of how well what we are doing in Laos is being handled, there probably isn't much argument. But there is the question of just how much of what we are doing we should be doing."

[From the Baltimore Sun, May 21, 1971]

CASE REPORTS CONFIRMATION UNITED STATES FINANCES THAIS IN LAOS

(By Gene Oishi)

WASHINGTON.—Senator Clifford P. Case (R., N.J.) said today "government sources" have confirmed that the United States is financing 4,000 to 6,000 Thai troops in Laos in accordance with a still-secret agreement.

In a speech on the Senate floor, Mr. Case said he first read about the U.S.-Thai agreement in the *Christian Science Monitor* on April 17, but that the State Department still has not responded to his queries on the article.

THROUGH THE CIA

Since then, Mr. Case said, "I was able to ascertain, on an absolutely not-for-quotation basis from government sources, that there are 4,000 to 6,000 Thai troops in Laos and the U.S. government, through the CIA, is paying for them."

While he places no faith in the credibility of Radio Hanoi, he added, he was also aware of its broadcasts discussing the presence of Thai troops in Laos.

"My perhaps plaintive question is: should a U.S. senator who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee have to learn of important agreements our government has made by reading the newspapers, by talking privately with government officials who do not wish to be quoted and by listening to foreign radio broadcasts?" Mr. Case said.

CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION

He suggested that the alleged agreement with Thailand violated the Constitution in two respects: the Senate has not ratified it and Congress has not appropriated any funds for paying Thai troops in Laos.

Meanwhile, Mr. Case joined Senator Harold E. Hughes (D., Iowa) and Senator Richard S. Schweiker (R., Pa.) in co-sponsoring today two amendments to the draft bill which is pending on the Senate floor.

The two amendments, designed to lead to an all-volunteer Army, would extend the draft for only one year instead two as the bill now provides, and sharply increase military pay.

[From the Baltimore News American, May 20, 1971]

SECRET THAI DEAL CHARGED BY CASE

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Clifford P. Case, R-N.J., today charged the Nixon administration with "apparent widening of American involvement in Southeast Asia" by secretly agreeing to pick up the tab for thousands of Thai combat troops in Laos.

He charged in a prepared Senate speech that this could cost the American taxpayer "tens of millions of dollars" and "lead our country into a serious military involvement if we ever had to bail out the Thais."

Despite the administration's failure to cooperate with Congress, Case disclosed, "I was able to ascertain, on an absolutely not for quotation basis from government sources, that there are 4,000 to 6,000 Thai troops in Laos and the U.S. government, through CIA, is paying for them."

Case disclosed that he had sought for the last month to get an explanation from Secretary of State William P. Rogers and other high administration officials of why the secret pact was made without consultation with Congress.

But the New Jersey senator said that his month-old letter was still unanswered and that Acting Secretary of State John Irwin, during Rogers' absence in the Middle East, had refused to discuss the issue, except in a closed-door, "executive" session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

"I am sure that at some future time an administration representative will sit down with the Foreign Relations Committee behind locked doors and inform us how and why the United States is paying for Thai troops in Laos," Case added.

"But this will be months after the fact," he charged, "and we shall undoubtedly be told about an on-going program which would be difficult to stop even if we were so inclined."

"The administration should have consulted with us before embarking on a new policy," the senator contended, adding that "our nation's foreign policy is weakened when it does not reflect consultation and interaction with the American people."

"Moreover, the Congress has the sole constitutional authority to appropriate funds," Case pointed out. "These are presumably government funds being paid to Thailand."

But Congress has never directly voted a penny to pay Thai troops in Laos.

"The money comes out of that vast treasure chest, which Congress has appropriated but never controlled, for discretionary military and intelligence purposes," Case charged. "I strongly believe that Congress should control this money. Certainly we should know how it is being spent."

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, May 20, 1971]

(By John J. Farmer)

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Clifford P. Case, R-N.J., charged today that the Nixon administration has negotiated and is financing a sharp increase of Thai troops in Laos without congressional consent.

"This is an apparent widening of American involvement in Southeast Asia, and the administration should have consulted with us before embarking on a new policy," he asserted in a speech for delivery on the Senate floor.

The speech continues—indeed steps up—Case's criticism of the Nixon administration's war, information and defense budget policies.

He expressed particular anger that even his position on the Foreign Relations Committee provided no access to the agreement with Thailand. He discovered it first in the Christian Science Monitor, Case said.

LETTER UNANSWERED

The New Jersey Republican said he wrote to Secretary of State Rogers seeking information. The letter remains unanswered, Case said, but other government sources indicated "that there are four to six thousand Thai troops in Laos and the U.S. Government, through the CIA, is paying for them."

The agreement violates the constitutional right of the Senate to review treaties, Case charged.

Some, he said, might argue that the agreement is not a treaty, but executive agreement, a practice done early in American history to facilitate the handling of minor business with foreign governments.

"I find it hard to believe that the framers of the Constitution would not have considered as a treaty an agreement which calls for the potential expenditure of tens of millions of dollars and which might lead the country into a serious military involvement if we had to bail out the Thais," he declared.

NO DIRECT VOTE

Congress, he continued, has sole constitutional authority to appropriate these funds but has never voted directly on the issue. The Cooper-Church amendment prohibits American financing of mercenaries in Laos, except to protect an American withdrawal, Case said.

"The money," he declared, "comes out of that vast treasure chest which Congress has appropriated but never controlled for discretionary military and intelligence purposes. I strongly believe that Congress should control this money. Certainly we should know how it is being spent."

Although his letter remains unanswered, Case said, the State Department tried to persuade him not to press the issue when Acting Secretary of State John Irwin appeared before a May 3 Foreign Relations Committee meeting.

Case raised the issue nevertheless—"I felt that both Congress and the American people had a right to know"—but Irwin refused to discuss it except in closed session, the senator said.

Case predicted that eventually administration representatives will provide details of the Laos operation "behind the locked doors."

"But this will be months after the fact, and we shall undoubtedly be told about an ongoing program which would be difficult to stop even we were so included," Case said.

The events mock Rogers' recent protests of the administration's recognition of the need for consultation with Congress, Case indicated. At the same time the senator stressed his own awareness that some foreign agreements must be negotiated in secrecy.

"But Congress and the people should be informed," he said, "before our country is indelibly committed to a position . . . for the people must be the ultimate arbiter of the course our nation follows."

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Evening Times, May 20, 1971]

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.) said today that U.S. payments to Thai mercenaries fighting in Laos represent a "widening of American involvement in Southeast Asia" and are a violation of the Cooper-Church provisions on Laos.

In a speech prepared for delivery on the Senate floor, the senator said an informed government source told him that the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) is paying for about 4,000-6,000 Thai troops presently in Laos.

The Cooper-Church Amendment cited by Case prohibits U.S. payment for the use of mercenaries in Laos, except to protect U.S. troops as they withdraw or to aid in the release of American prisoners.

The New Jersey legislator criticized the Nixon administration for consummating this arrangement with Thailand without consulting or even notifying the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which he is a member.

SECRET AGREEMENTS

Case has been long critical of the increasing use of secret executive agreements, like the Thai arrangement, as an expedient substitute for formal treaties, which require the approval of the Senate.

"I find it hard to believe that the framers of the Constitution would not have considered as a treaty an agreement which calls for the potential expenditure of tens of millions of dollars, and which might lead our country into a serious military involvement if we ever had to bail out the Thais," Case said.

"Congress has never directly voted a penny to pay Thai troops in Laos," Case said, adding that the money "comes out of that vast treasure chest, which Congress has appropriated but never controlled, for discretionary military and intelligence purposes."

The senator has previously suggested that the large CIA budget be studied and approved in the same itemized way that Congress appropriates all other federal funds.

NO DISCUSSION

Case noted that acting Secretary of State John Irwin refused at an open hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee earlier this month to discuss the question of Thai troops in Laos.

The senator said he is sure that the administration will put the facts of the situation before the committee in a closed session sometime in the future, but only after it has become difficult or impossible to reverse the events.

"Obviously, there is a need for secrecy while negotiations are still under way, but congress and the people should be informed before our country is indelibly committed to a position," Case said.

The senator said the support of Thai mercenaries in Laos "is an apparent widening of American involvement in Southeast Asia, and the administration should have consulted with us before embarking on a new policy."

The senator added, "If an action by our country cannot stand up to public exposure, then our country cannot stand up to public exposure, then our leaders should seriously reconsider that action."

Case said he first learned of the Thai agree-

ment from an article in the Christian Science Monitor on April 17.

The agreement was confirmed, he said, by a government official who emphatically asked that he not be quoted. The presence of the Thai troops in Laos was also discussed, in broadcasts by Radio Hanoi, whose credibility "I place almost no faith in," Case added.

SOMETHING'S WRONG

The senator said something's wrong with the process of foreign policy decision-making when a senator who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee has to learn of important agreements our government has made by reading the newspaper by talking privately with government officials who do not wish to be quoted, and by listening to foreign radio broadcasts.

Case said he has not yet received a reply to a letter he sent to Secretary of State William P. Rogers asking for further information about the Thai mercenary situation.

The letter asks for information on funding of the Thai troops and U.S. assurances, if any, to the Thai government of American military support in the event that the Thai troops encounter difficulties in Laos.

[From the Washington Post, May 22, 1971]

SENATORS TOLD CIA AID IN LAOS

(By Spencer Rich)

Two investigators just back from Indochina told a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee in secret session yesterday that the CIA is covertly financing 4,800 Thai troops fighting in northern Laos in support of the Laotian government.

Sen. Clifford P. Case (R-Me.) told reporters after the meeting that the CIA had begun hiring Thais several years ago to fight in northern Laos, and was now apparently considerably increasing the number because, after years of war in Laos, "the pool of people available for military operations is shrinking rapidly."

These expenditures, however, have been kept secret from the public and are not revealed in budget and appropriations documents.

Case said that the report given to the subcommittee by staff members James Lowenstein and Richard Moose confirmed his own information, obtained here privately from government sources, that "there are 4,000 to 6,000 Thai troops in Laos and the U.S. government, through the CIA, is paying for them."

Case earlier had cited one newspaper report that for six or seven years there were only 1,000 Thai troops there but that number had jumped in the past year.

Senators and staff members at the meeting were reluctant to discuss the Lowenstein-Moose report because, according to Foreign Relations Committee Chairman W. Fulbright (D-Ark.), government agencies had imposed as a condition of cooperation with the two investigators that the information they received be declassified by an Executive Branch before it could be made public.

However, when asked how many Thai troops were being financed by the CIA, Fulbright answered, "It's not very secret. I think it's 4,800."

Fulbright said he expected the committee to sponsor some proposals for changes in the basic CIA law, especially with regard to informing Congress about its activities.

Case, who had just received a reply from Secretary of State William P. Rogers to his earlier requests for information about the matter, said facts stated by Lowenstein and Moose in their report "indicate clearly to me that information contained in the State Department letter was incomplete and in certain respects inaccurate."

Subcommittee Chairman Stuart Symington (D-Mo.), Case and Fulbright all said it was extremely important that the Lowen-

June 4, 1971

stein-Moose report be declassified so that, as Case put, "we can lay the thing out for the American people so they can make the judgments" as to whether the nation should support such activities.

Another source said, however, that the pay and allowances for the Thais would run to perhaps \$2,000 a year per man—or about \$10 million for the 4,800 men—plus costs for equipment, transportation and other items that could easily double, perhaps triple, the initial figure.

Case also said the report confirmed that while general U.S. air activities over northern Laos had been decreasing, U.S. B-52 bombing raids there had increased.

Other Senators present gave these added details:

Meo tribesmen in the north, operating from a center provided by the secret CIA base at Long Cheng, were so decimated that the Thai troops were needed to supply extra manpower.

Total U.S. costs in Laos, not just for the Thais but for aid to the Laotian government and interdiction in the south, was so great that "\$100 million wouldn't touch it."

The State Department has offered to have Marshall Green, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern and Pacific Affairs, brief the committee on Laos operations in secret session.

Sen. Frank Church (D-Idaho) said, "The whole lurid tale of this covert war makes it obvious that, if Congress is to recover control over war and peace, it must make the CIA return to the role it was originally intended to fill, that of an intelligence agency collecting information. Covert operations of this kind will have to be taken away." He is sponsoring legislation to do just that.

GENOCIDE CONVENTION PLEDGE RENEWED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, since January 11, 1967, I have called for ratification of the Genocide Convention every day the Senate has been in session. I have delivered 815 speeches during the past 5 years pleading for action. But we are little closer to ratification today than we were June 16, 1949, when President Truman transmitted the convention to the Senate.

Today I renew my pledge of 1967. I again state, "I intend to speak day after day in this body to remind the Senate of our failure to act and of the necessity for prompt action."

How long must the citizens of this great land await our verdict? A new generation of Americans have reached adulthood since the convention was first submitted. The President supports the convention. The Secretary of State and the Attorney General agree that there are no constitutional drawbacks to ratification. What citizen of this Nation feels anything but disdain for the act of genocide?

Why has the Senate not acted? Why does the Senate continue our international embarrassment? Why have we set ourselves apart from the civilized world?

Mr. President, the Senate has failed the Nation and the world in the realm of human rights. I call upon the Senate to right this wrong and ratify the human rights treaties—now.

THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I have spoken here before about the need

for redirecting the great capacity and energy of the Army Corps of Engineers to cope with the many environmental problems across the Nation that were born from the once much sought after projects such as dams. I have pointed out the problems along the Snake and Columbia Rivers as current and acute examples. I have recognized that we all must share the blame if there is to be any for the damages we are now suffering.

Except for a handful of conservationists and fishermen across the country not many of us questioned the economic and development benefits of dam construction which often meant flood control, irrigated land, recreation, more jobs, and more money. No one thought about the need to preserve a wild free-running stream—we had loads of them. No one worried about the threats to our salmon and steelhead population. We were abundantly supplied.

Now, it is a different story, and the story of the Snake and Columbia Rivers is becoming a common one across the country.

Why should we not reorient our priorities so that an organization such as the corps, which has proved by its past record of public works accomplishments that it is up to meeting the needs of the time, and can indeed dedicate its efforts and abilities toward a goal of environmental restoration. The corps could well become our major tool in meeting this great goal, for it is already here, organized. All it needs is a directive from the Congress to turn the tide.

Mr. President, the Nation today is weighing in balance our environmental values with our economic and technological progress. The Nation has awakened and is running way ahead of us on this. I believe it is time we catch up with them, before the overwhelming public opinion is so far ahead that it can no longer look back and see us.

Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post a small item appeared regarding Assistant Secretary Reed's testimony before a House Subcommittee. Mr. Reed has shown considerable moral courage in his reported testimony. He has sounded the alarm for us. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 4, 1971]
INTERIOR OFFICIAL SCORES U.S. WATERWAY ACTIONS

(By Elsie Carper)

Nathaniel P. Reed, the Interior Department's new assistant secretary, accused two other federal agencies yesterday of paying "nothing more than lip service" to environmental protection.

In testimony before the House Conservation Subcommittee, Reed declared that stream construction projects by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Agriculture Department's Soil Conservation Service are having "a devastating effect" upon the nation's waterways.

"What is needed," he said, "is a complete rethink and redirection by the men who are designing and constructing the projects."

Reed, former chairman of Florida's Department of Air and Water Pollution, was sworn in as Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks less than a month ago.

He was congratulated by Subcommittee Chairman Henry S. Reuss (D-Wisc.), a longtime critic of federal programs to dredge, modify and channel streams. Reuss called his testimony "the finest" he has heard.

Rep. Sam Steiger (R-Ariz.) countered that he did not share Reuss' enthusiasm for Reed's "sweeping condemnation" of the projects. Later, in commenting on Reed's yes-and-no replies to questions, Steiger said "you are going to have to avoid those direct answers if you are going to stay alive in this town."

Reed told the subcommittee that "stream channel alteration under the banner of channel 'improvement' for navigation, flood reduction, and agricultural drainage is undoubtedly one of the more, if not the most, destructive water development or management practices from the viewpoint of renewable natural resources."

The projects, he said, have resulted in severe damage to fish and waterfowl habitat and have increased siltation to the point that they are "the aquatic version of the dust bowl disaster."

He urged a complete review of all river and stream channelization projects by federal environmental agencies and a new national policy on flood control.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I noticed in reading my statement of yesterday opposing the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 that by typographical error one word was omitted from a paragraph on page S. 8148 which substantially changes my meaning. I would like at this time to restate the paragraph in its correct form:

After Peace Corps and VISTA officials were unable to agree on even the basic organizational and functional questions, the White House turned the matter over to the Office of Management and Budget and asked it to come up with a plan. The OMB plan is basically a listing of the programs to be affected by the merger along with an organization chart. The OMB plan which the White House submitted to Congress does not answer the questions of whether these programs will retain their separate identities and names, how they would relate to one another, and where the efficiencies or savings will be. Administration testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization has clarified very little.

I ask unanimous consent to have this correction be made in the permanent Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SENATE CHAPLAIN'S BACCALAUREATE SERMON AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, last Sunday the University of Wyoming celebrated its annual commencement exercises, the 81st in the school's history.

Having consolidated the activities into a single day, the baccalaureate speaker makes the single principle address.

This year we were most fortunate to have the Chaplain of the Senate to speak to the graduates, their families, and friends.

Few speakers have been as warmly received; fewer still have commanded the attention and interest Dr. Elson's words generated.